

*REMARKS*

*Pending Claims:*

Claims 1 to 16 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 8, and 13 have been amended to further define and describe the invention. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and the remarks herein.

*Rejections of the Claims:*

The Office Action maintains the objection to claims 1 to 3, 8, 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as being unpatentable in view of Park (U.S. 6,408,175). The reasons given for the anticipation rejection appear to be identical to the reasons given in the first Office Action. The Office Action further rejects claims 4-6, 9-12, 14-16 as obvious over Park in view of Harris, and claim 7 as obvious over Park in view of Blanke.

From our understanding from the comments under the heading "Response to Arguments" on page 6 of the present Office Action, the Examiner agrees that the primary reference, Park, discloses only a single mobile telecommunications network. It is respectfully submitted that a single mobile telecommunications network is completely different to the present invention where a home mobile telecommunications network is provided.

As now explicitly set forth in independent claims 1, 8, and 13, the mobile user equipment, such as a cellular telephone, has a subscription with the home mobile telecommunications network. The home mobile telecommunications network operates in particular geographical area (for example, a particular country or state). The mobile user equipment will usually be operated in the home mobile telecommunications network.

However, the mobile user equipment may also be operated outside the home mobile telecommunications network, in the serving mobile telecommunications network. There will typically be a "roaming" agreement between the home telecommunications network and the serving mobile telecommunications network which allows the mobile user equipment to operate within the serving mobile telecommunications network and for charges for use of that serving mobile telecommunication network being made by virtue of a subscription of the mobile user equipment to the home mobile telecommunications network.

The operation of the embodiment of the invention is described in detail in the remarks submitted in response to the first Office Action, and will not be repeated here.

In the amended claims the applicant has endeavored to further emphasize the nature of the home mobile telecommunications network and the separate serving mobile telecommunications network. More specifically, each of the independent claims now require as follows:

[I]n an area covered by a serving mobile telecommunications network, ...

the mobile user equipments has a subscription with the home mobile telecommunications network,

the mobile user equipment is adapted to make and receive telephone calls when within an area covered by the home mobile telecommunications network by wireless communication between the mobile user equipment and the mobile telecommunications network, and

the home mobile telecommunications network is operable to generate authentication vectors for allowing the mobile user equipment to make calls by wireless communication between the mobile user equipment and the serving mobile telecommunications network[.]

In the amended claims emphasize that there are two separate mobile telecommunications networks, specifically claiming that the mobile user equipment can communicate wirelessly with the respective mobile telecommunications network when in their area of coverage.

This is in sharp contrast to the Park reference. In the Park reference only a single mobile telecommunications network is disclosed. Park does refer, for example, in Figure 3, to a "home system" comprising OTAF, HLR and AC; and a "serving system" comprising MSC and VLR. Rather, this terminology is used in Park simply to refer to different parts of a single mobile telecommunications network. For example, the elements of the "home system" might be provided in a centralized location, whereas the elements of the "serving system" would be dispersed throughout the geographical coverage area of the home network. Only

In re Appln. of Wright  
Application No. 09/714,404

the "serving system" will be capable of wireless communication with the mobile user equipment. The "home system" will not communicate directly with the mobile user equipment at all, but will communicate by a wired connection with the "serving system."

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Park does not and cannot disclose or teach the claimed arrangement. Therefore, the anticipation rejection based on Park must fall. Moreover, because nothing in Park teaches or discloses the claimed arrangement, whether alone or in combination with the Harris or Blanke references, the claimed invention is not obvious over the cited references.

*Conclusion:*

The application is considered to be in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Pamela J. Ruschau, Reg. No. 34,242  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.  
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900  
180 North Stetson Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780  
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)  
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: June 29, 2004

Amendment or ROA - Final (Revised 7/29/03)